

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were originally filed in the present application.

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20 and 23 were rejected in the January 8, 2007 Office Action.

Claims 2, 5-8, 10, 13-16, 18, 21, 22 and 24 were objected to in the January 8, 2007 Office Action.

No claims have been allowed.

Claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-22 are amended herein

Claims 1-24 remain in the present application.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Beginning on page 2 of the January 8, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-4, 9, 11-12, 17, 19-20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0114156 to *Kinnavy* (the “Kinnavy reference”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,382 to *Mansfield, et al.* (the “Mansfield reference”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,859,440 to *Sonti, et al.* (the “Sonti reference”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,725 to *Phillips, et al.* (the “Phillips reference”). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the Examiner’s suggestions in support of the rejection.

Independent Claim 1 current requires:

For use in a wireless network, a base station capable of controlling the use of the reduced slot cycle mode by mobile stations communicating with said base station, said base station comprising:

a traffic monitor capable of monitoring message traffic levels handled by said base station; and a reduced slot cycle controller capable of receiving *traffic statistics information from said traffic monitor and determining whether use of said reduced slot cycle mode by said mobile stations communicating with said base station interferes with scheduling of paging message transmissions by said base station,*

wherein in response to a determination that said use of the reduced slot cycle mode by said mobile stations does interfere with said scheduling of paging message transmissions by said base station, *the reduced slot cycle controller causes said base station to transmit a first control message indicating that the reduced slot cycle mode is disabled in said base station.* (emphasis added).

Notably, Claim 1 currently requires that the reduced slot controller be capable of receiving traffic statistics information from the traffic monitor and determining whether use of the reduced slot cycle mode by said mobile stations communicating with said base station *interferes with scheduling of paging message transmissions by said base station.* Second, Claim 1 also notably requires that *in response to a determination that the reduced slot mode will interfere with scheduling of paging message transmissions by the base station, the reduced slot cycle mode is disabled in the base station.*

The Kinnavy reference, either alone or in any combination with the Mansfield reference, the Sonti reference or the Phillips reference, fails to teach or disclose every element currently required by Claim 1. For example, as suggested by the Examiner on page 5 of the January 8, 2007 Office Action, the Kinnavy reference, either alone or in any combination with the Mansfield reference, the Sonti reference or the Phillips reference, fails to teach or disclose determining whether use of the reduced slot cycle mode by said mobile stations communicating with said base station *interferes with scheduling of paging message transmissions by said base station and in response to a determination that the reduced slot mode will interfere with scheduling of paging message transmissions by the base station, the reduced slot cycle mode is disabled in the base station,* as required by Claim 1.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation within any of the cited reference to prompt one of ordinary skill to selectively combine discrete elements from each and then seek out still other elements as currently required by Claim 1 and its dependents. Similar arguments hold true for independent Claims 9 and 17 and their respective dependents.

With respect to independent Claim 23, the Kinnavy reference, either alone or in any combination with the Mansfield reference, the Sonti reference or the Phillips reference, fails to teach or disclose every element as required by Claim 23. For example, there is no teaching or disclosure within any of the cited references of a mobile station is capable of receiving from said base station *a first control message indicating that the reduced slot cycle mode is disabled in said base station* and, in response to said first control message, said *mobile station operates only in the full slot cycle mode*, as required by Claim 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and the withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

Beginning on page 5 of the January 8, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 2, 5-10, 13-16, 18, 21, 22 and 24 and suggested that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for this determination and respectfully submit that these claims are patentably distinct.

SUMMARY

For the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims and that this application be passed to issue. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *jmockler@munckbutrus.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

MUNCK BUTRUS, P.C.

Date: 22 March 2007

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
Phone: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: *jmockler@munckbutrus.com*


John T. Mockler
John T. Mockler
Registration No. 39,775